

**111 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRWP-1011-2023

Date of Decision: 03.02.2023

Shaffy Rani and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Ram Kumar Saini, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been under Article 226 of Constitution of India for issuance of direction to respondents No.2 and 3, to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of respondents No.4 to 8 and not to interfere in their matrimonial life.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that both the petitioners are major and have married against the wishes of respondents no.4 to 8 and have sought protection to their life and liberty. They apprehend danger from respondents no.4 to 8. Their marriage certificate and photographs evidencing their marriage are on record as Annexures P-3 and P-4. The petitioners have submitted a representation dated 30.01.2023 (Annexure P-5) to respondent no.2.

Notice of motion.

Mr. B.S. Virk, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State and Mr. Vivek Gupta, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.4 to 8.

Learned counsel for respondents No.4 to 8 has fairly submitted that they have no objection with the relationship of the petitioners,

however, being parents and family members, they should be granted opportunity to interact with their daughter i.e. petitioner No.1.

Without entering upon an exercise to evaluate the evidentiary value of the documents placed on the file, I dispose of the petition with a direction to respondent no.2-Superintendent of Police, Fatehabd, to decide the representation (Annexure P-5) of the petitioners and grant them protection, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived. It is further directed that when the petitioners and respondents No.4 to 8 are called by respondent No.2, he would ensure a cordial meeting of the petitioners with them.

It is clarified that this order shall not be taken to grant immunity to the petitioners from legal action for violation of law, if any, committed by them. This order would not be understood having expressed any opinion whatsoever by this Court on the validity of the marriage of the petitioners.

Disposed of.

Needless to say that the protection of the petitioners would be ensured by respondent No.2 in accordance with law.

03.02.2023			(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
sharmila			JUDGE
	Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
	Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No